UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/036,236	03/06/1998	DAVID M. OLIVER	005-905-300	5721

20433	7590	08/25/2006

BLODGETT BLODGETT
43 HIGHLAND STREET
WORCESTER, MA 016092797

EXAMINER
GART, MATTHEW S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3625	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/036,236	OLIVER ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Matthew S. Gart	3625	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th correspondence addr ss* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-82* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-82* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Summary of the Office Action Mailed on June 3rd, 2005

- **Claims 1-82** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being based on a public use <u>and</u> sale of the invention.

- **Claims 1-8, 11-25, and 28-34, 63-64, 66-72, and 74-82** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Exhibit O.

- **Claims 9-10 and 26-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Exhibit O in view of Exhibit L.

- **Claims 36-62** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Exhibit O in view of Teper (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665).

- **Claims 65 and 73** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Exhibit O and Teper (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665), as applied to claims 64 and 71, respectively, and further in view of Exhibit L.

Request for Information under 37 CFR 1.105

The Applicant submitted evidence on March 10th, 2006 in response to the
Request for Information under 37 CFR 1.105 mailed on January 6th, 2006. Said
evidence in combination with the third declaration of William P. Densmore Jr. filed on
October 5, 2005, is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-82 under 35 U.S.C.
102(b) as being based on a public use <u>and</u> sale of the invention. Therefore, said
rejection of claims 1-82 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being based on a public use <u>and</u>
sale of the invention is vacated.

Public Use

Said evidence comprises a series of articles and press releases relating to
applicant's own work, and is sufficient to overcome the allegation that there was a public
use of the claimed invention prior to the critical date of March 7th, 2006.

The Examiner notes, the inventor must maintain sufficient control over the
invention during <u>testing</u> by third parties. A significant determinative factor in questions
of experimental purpose is the extent of supervision and control maintained by an
inventor over an invention during an alleged period of experimentation. The Applicant
submitted a licensing agreement and a non-disclosure agreement, dated January 12th,
1996, in combination with other evidence, <u>to show the present state of the invention as</u>
<u>experimental</u>, and detailing the non-disclosure requirement on the tester, prohibiting
disclosure copying or reverse engineering.

Furthermore, the evidence submitted by the Applicant is sufficient to show that

the Token Validation System of the claimed invention, even though conceived, was not

publicly operational prior to the critical date of the invention. As presented on October

5, 2005, the Applicant declared there existed no operational embodiment of the Token

Validation System, as of the critical date of the invention.

Public Sale

Said evidence comprises a series of articles and press releases relating to

applicant's own work, and is sufficient to overcome the allegation that there was a

commercial offer for sale of the claimed invention prior to the critical date of March 7th,

2006.

The on-sale bar applies when two conditions are satisfied before the critical date.

First, the product must be the subject of a commercial offer for sale... Second, the

invention must be ready for patenting." Id. at 67, 119 S.Ct. at 311-12, 48 USPQ2d at

1646-47. While evidence uncovered by the Examiner in combination with evidence

submitted by the applicant announced potential prospective costs of the product, the

evidence does not rise to the level of showing a commercial offer for sale of the claimed

invention. The evidence mainly are in the form of marketing materials, intended to

promote investment revenue and generate alliances with publishers.

Non-patent literature relied on by the Examiner is summarized below:

Exhibit	Description
A	"Newshare: One-bill, universal-password access to Internet information available by subscription or 'by click' early next year via Newshare Corps.'s 'Clickshare' publishing system; advertisers can track systemwide visits by anonymous user"; Business Wire; Business Editors; September 15, 1995.
B	"Clickshare Server Beta Available in October"; Newsbytes News Network; September 15, 1995.
C	"Tracking Transactions"; Internet Week, v1, n30; Oct. 20, 1995.
D	"Digital Syndication Headache Removed Through Newshare"; Telecomworldwire; Sept. 18, 1995.
E	"Newshare Corp: Newshare corp.'s Clickshare software makes possible digital syndicates"; M2 Presswire; Sept 15, 1995.
F	"Newshare's Digital Online Writers' Syndicate 09/12/95"; Newsbytes; Sept 12, 1995.
G	"Special Newshare Publishing Members Rates", Newshare Release; Copyright 1995.
H	Johnson, Craig A.: "Newshare Corp. letter on 'indecent' language"; Dec. 9, 1995.
I	"Clickshare(sm) Registration"; Newshare/Clickshare Release; Copyright 1995.
J	"What is Clickshare(sm)? A Short Summary"; Newshare/Clickshare Release; Copyright 1995.
K	"Building a free market for digital information"; presented at the Interactive Newspapers '96 Conference; San Francisco CA, USA; February 22, 1996.
L	"Questions often asked by prospective Clickshare publishers"; Newshare Release; Copyright 1995.
M	"Clickshare Universal-ID, Profiling and Micro-Transaction System Enters Alpha; Personalized 'Test Drives' Begin"; News Corp. Release dated Oct. 24, 1995; Red Rock Eater Digest; Aug. 18, 2003.
N	"How the Web was Won"; Clickshare/Newshare Press Release; Sept. 15, 1995.
O	"Clickshare(sm) alpha up; 'test drives' available"; Newshare Corp. Release; October 26, 1995.
P	"Newshare(sm): Interim Publishing Membership Enrollment Information"; Newshare/Clickshare Release; page updated 09-22-95.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8, 11-25, and 28-34, 63, 64, 66-72, and 74-82 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Exhibit O.

Note: Exhibits A-P are printed publications which each describes the

Newshare/Clickshare invention and are dated more than one year prior to March 7,

1997. Accordingly, each Exhibit qualifies as prior art under 35 USC 102(b).

Exhibit O discloses, with reference to claim 1:

Preamble

> *Clickshare is <u>a complete, distributed, user-management system</u> which provides the only true <u>third-party validation</u> of <u>web usage</u>. It differentiates "eyeballs" rather than just counting them. It <u>protects personal privacy</u> and the publisher/subscriber relationship.*

Element (a)

> *"Clickshare's versatile <u>architecture is core technology for a worldwide free market</u> <u>for digital communications -- a true information exchange,</u>" said Densmore.*

Element (b)

> *Clickshare has <u>two principal components,</u> Oliver says. Clickshare-enhanced <u>Web server software runs on publishers' computers as a primary piece of</u> <u>controlling software or as an adjunct to other UNIX-based server software</u>. It <u>logs</u> <u>user registration, authentication, personalization and micro- transactions.</u>*

> *Each user has a single "home base" at a Publishing Member (likely to be a local or specialty publication with whom they have a continuing relation). Clickshare users register just once with their home base, providing credit-card information by phone, fax, mail or secure Internet connection. At no time do credit-card numbers or other personal information traverse the Clickshare system.*

Element (c)

> *Clickshare tracks content served to users regardless of the location of their "home" Publishing Member. Aggregate micro- charges, settled monthly or more frequently, allocating commissions, royalties and transaction fees, thus form the basis of a system resembling an ATM network.*

Element (d)

> *A portion of all fees accumulated by a user for all visited Clickshare-enabled sites is retained by the user's home Publishing Member. This is termed a "referral commission." And Newshare retains a portion for its role in tracking and clearing transactions. At least 50 percent of each transaction goes to the content owner as a royalty.*

Element (e)

> *Clickshare(SM) permits consumers to access information on multiple, unrelated Internet Web servers with a single ID and password. It gives publishers revenues not only from their own information but from the information their users buy elsewhere. And it gives advertisers the best way to measure web traffic by specific user.*

Element (f)

> *The second piece of essential software, the Clickshare token-validation service (TVS) server, is run by Newshare Corp. or licensees. It creates and validates authentication tokens, brokers non-personal user preferences among publishers, and maintains "page visit" records from multiple independent sites sortable by anonymous user number, page visited and site ID.*

Exhibit O further discloses:

Regarding claim 2

>   The *Clickshare-enhanced Web Server* -- which is browser independent -- *is*
>   *provided to Member Publishers* by Newshare Corp. *free under license.*
>   *Newshare's back-end service network exchanges data with the Internet servers*
>   *of Clickshare-enabled sites, validating users and tracking all discrete page*
>   *accesses -- chargeable or free -- across every participating site.*
>
>   *Clickshare leaves to each Publishing Member the marketing contours of its*
>   *relationship to its customers. Each Publishing Member is thus free to use its own*
>   *model for user subscription or per-page rates.*

Regarding claim 3

>   *Thereafter, a user begins a Clickshare(sm) session as simply as logging in to the*
>   *online world in the first place. The user must enter a personal ID and password*
>   *just once during each session. In response, their home Publishing Member*
>   *provides them a personalized, updated, jumpoff page of useful links, based on*
>   *the personal topical-interest profile the user provided at initial registration.*

Regarding claim 4

>   *Thereafter, a user begins a Clickshare(sm) session as simply as logging in to the*
>   *online world in the first place. The user must enter a personal ID and password*
>   *just once during each session. In response, their home Publishing Member*
>   *provides them a personalized, updated, jumpoff page of useful links, based on*
>   *the personal topical-interest profile the user provided at initial registration.*

Regarding claim 5

>   *The second piece of essential software, the Clickshare token-validation service*
>   *(TVS) server, is run by Newshare Corp. or licensees. It creates and validates*
>   *authentication tokens, brokers non-personal user preferences among publishers,*
>   *and maintains "page visit" records from multiple independent sites sortable by*
>   *anonymous user number, page visited and site ID.*
>
>   *"At no time does Clickshare know a user's name or demographic profile," says*
>   *Oliver. "Only the user's home-base publisher has this information."*

> *As they <u>browse effortlessly to Clickshare-enabled and other sites</u>, users can be confident that <u>the link between their identity and their tracks does not go beyond their home Publisher.</u> Clickshare provides <u>mechanisms to establish charge limits and receive periodic reports of charges.</u>*

Regarding claim 6

> *Thereafter, a <u>user begins a Clickshare(sm) session</u> as simply as <u>logging in to the online world</u> in the first place. The <u>user must enter a personal ID and password just once during each session.</u> In response, their <u>home Publishing Member provides them a personalized, updated, jumpoff page of useful links</u>, based on the personal topical-interest profile the user provided at initial registration.*

Regarding claim 7

> *The second piece of essential software, the Clickshare <u>token-validation service (TVS) server, is run by Newshare Corp. or licensees.</u> It <u>creates and validates authentication tokens, brokers non-personal user preferences among publishers, and maintains "page visit" records from multiple independent sites sortable by anonymous user number, page visited and site ID</u>.*

Regarding claim 8

> *The <u>Clickshare-enhanced Web Server</u> -- which is browser independent -- <u>is provided to Member Publishers</u> by Newshare Corp. free under license. <u>Newshare's back-end service network exchanges data with the Internet servers of Clickshare-enabled sites, validating users and tracking all discrete page accesses -- chargeable or free -- across every participating site</u>.*

Regarding claim 11

> *The <u>Clickshare-enhanced Web Server</u> -- which is browser independent -- <u>is provided to Member Publishers</u> by Newshare Corp. free under license. <u>Newshare's back-end service network exchanges data with the Internet servers of Clickshare-enabled sites, validating users and tracking all discrete page accesses -- chargeable or free -- across every participating site</u>.*

Regarding claim 12

The Clickshare-enhanced Web Server -- which is browser independent -- is provided to Member Publishers by Newshare Corp. free under license. Newshare's back-end service network exchanges data with the Internet servers of Clickshare-enabled sites, validating users and tracking all discrete page accesses -- chargeable or free -- across every participating site.

Regarding claim 13

Clickshare(SM) permits consumers to access information on multiple, unrelated Internet Web servers with a single ID and password. It gives publishers revenues not only from their own information but from the information their users buy elsewhere. And it gives advertisers the best way to measure web traffic by specific user.

Each user has a single "home base" at a Publishing Member (likely to be a local or specialty publication with whom they have a continuing relation). Clickshare users register just once with their home base, providing credit-card information by phone, fax, mail or secure Internet connection. At no time do credit-card numbers or other personal information traverse the Clickshare system.

Clickshare tracks content served to users regardless of the location of their "home" Publishing Member. Aggregate micro- charges, settled monthly or more frequently, allocating commissions, royalties and transaction fees, thus form the basis of a system resembling an ATM network.

A portion of all fees accumulated by a user for all visited Clickshare-enabled sites is retained by the user's home Publishing Member. This is termed a "referral commission." And Newshare retains a portion for its role in tracking and clearing transactions. At least 50 percent of each transaction goes to the content owner as a royalty.

Regarding claim 14

The second piece of essential software, the Clickshare token-validation service (TVS) server, is run by Newshare Corp. or licensees. It creates and validates authentication tokens, brokers non-personal user preferences among publishers, and maintains "page visit" records from multiple independent sites sortable by anonymous user number, page visited and site ID.

Regarding claim 15

> Thereafter, a _user begins a Clickshare(sm) session_ as simply as _logging in to the_
> _online world_ in the first place. The _user must enter a personal ID and password_
> _just once during each session_. In response, their _home Publishing Member_
> _provides them a personalized, updated, jumpoff page of useful links_, based on
> the personal topical-interest profile the user provided at initial registration.
>
> As they _browse effortlessly to Clickshare-enabled and other sites_, users can be
> confident that _the link between their identity and their tracks does not go beyond_
> _their home Publisher_. Clickshare provides _mechanisms to establish charge limits_
> _and receive periodic reports of charges_.
>
> The _Clickshare-enhanced Web Server_ -- which is browser independent -- _is_
> _provided to Member Publishers_ by Newshare Corp. free under license.
> _Newshare's back-end service network exchanges data with the Internet servers_
> _of Clickshare-enabled sites, validating users and tracking all discrete page_
> _accesses -- chargeable or free -- across every participating site_.
>
> Clickshare _tracks content served to users_ regardless of the location of their
> "home" Publishing Member. _Aggregate micro- charges, settled monthly or more_
> _frequently, allocating commissions, royalties and transaction fees, thus form the_
> _basis of a system resembling an ATM network_.

Regarding claim 16

> Beyond the model of payment for access to information, because it tracks known
> users (rather than Internet Protocol (IP) numbers), Clickshare may also serve as
> a _third-party circulation/viewership auditing mechanism for the advertising and_
> _publishing industry_, while leaving to users control of release of demographic and
> other data, and respecting their desires for privacy.

Regarding claim 17

> As they _browse effortlessly to Clickshare-enabled and other sites_, users can be
> confident that _the link between their identity and their tracks does not go beyond_
> _their home Publisher_. Clickshare provides _mechanisms to establish charge limits_
> _and receive periodic reports of charges_.

The Clickshare-enhanced Web Server -- which is browser independent -- is provided to Member Publishers by Newshare Corp. free under license. Newshare's back-end service network exchanges data with the Internet servers of Clickshare-enabled sites, validating users and tracking all discrete page accesses -- chargeable or free -- across every participating site.

A portion of all fees accumulated by a user for all visited Clickshare-enabled sites is retained by the user's home Publishing Member. This is termed a "referral commission." And Newshare retains a portion for its role in tracking and clearing transactions. At least 50 percent of each transaction goes to the content owner as a royalty.

Regarding claims 18-25, and 28-34

These claims are method claims which closely parallel system claims 1-8, and 11-17. These claims are rejected on grounds similar to those discussed above with regard to such system claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10, 26, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Exhibit O in view of Exhibit L.

Regarding claims 9 and 26

Exhibit O does not disclose the return of pricing and service-class information.

However, Exhibit L discloses:

Q: What about charging different prices to different users and for different types of information?

A: No problem. Embedded in the Clickshare(sm) system is the ability to delineate "page classes" which have different retail values. This permits a Publishing Member, for example, to have "tiers" of service. One tier might be free content open to the public. The next "tier" might be content open at no charge solely to Clickshare(sm) enabled users. Another "tier" might be open to the Publisher Member's own local users for a monthly flat subscription fee -- and charged "by the click" to remote Clickshare(sm) users. And a final tier might be charged to all users, but at a different price depending whether the user is local or remote. Since the Clickshare(sm) server can identify the "class" of an incoming user, it can price-differentiate its service to that user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the

system and method already disclosed in Exhibit O to have included the return of

preference, pricing and service-class information about the requesting client in order to

differentiate clients associated with service tiers for the purposes of access and billing.

Regarding claims 10 and 27

    Neither Exhibit O nor Exhibit L teach utilizing User Datagram Protocol to accomplish acceptance.

    However, the further modification of the combined system and method of Exhibits O and L would have been an obvious matter of protocol choice to one of ordinary skill in the art which would not have otherwise affected or effected the system and method already taught.

Claims 35-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentabl

over Exhibit O in view of Teper (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665).

Although Exhibit O discloses a token validation service, Exhibit O is silent to a

challenge-response protocol.

Teper, however, in a similar system and method (col. 1, lines 7-11), teaches a

verification means including a token and an authentication server adapted to allow each

provider to determine if a particular client is a member of the system, verify that the

client has authenticated at his home provider, and determine this client's access or

service privileges and criteria (col. 5 lines 30-37 and 45-48; col. 6 lines 53-61). The

verification means employs a challenge-response protocol (see col. 3, lines 5-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the

system and method disclosed in Exhibit O to have included the challenge-response

protocol taught by Teper in order to have realized the validation of the tokens disclosed

in Exhibit O using a known challenge-response protocol of the type taught by Teper.

Claims 65, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Exhibit O and Teper (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665), as applied to claims 64 and 71, respectively, and further in view of Exhibit L.

The combination of Exhibit O and Teper does not provide a billing viewer application.

Exhibit L, however, discloses that "Clickshare(sm) is designed to bundle dozens or even hundreds of individual information purchases during a monthly pan and then obtain the on-line consumer's approval to charge them".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the combination of Exhibit O and Teper to have included a billing viewer application in order that a consumer may first view an itemization of recorded purchases prior to authorizing the charge for such purchases to a credit network.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 10, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1-8, 11-25, and 28-34, 63-64, 66-72, and 74-82

The Applicant argues that Exhibit O dos not provide a "settling means, separate from a respective home provider... accessing a respective home provider registration database, and communicating with an account database maintained separately from a respective registration database."

The Examiner notes, Exhibit O clearly discloses and teaches the use of aggregate micro-charges, whereby these charges are settled monthly or more frequently, allocating commissions, royalties and transaction fees, thus forming the basis of a system resembling an ATM network.

The Examiner further notes, the disclosure of Exhibit O was in the public's possession before the critical date of invention. Such possession was enabled and effected because one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the publication's description of the invention with his [or her] own knowledge to make the claimed invention." In re Donohue, 766 F.2d 531, 226 USPQ 619 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

<u>Regarding claims 35-62</u>

The Applicant notes that a previously submitted Second Declaration of William P.

Densmore presented evidence effective to antedate the Teper reference.

The Examiner notes, said declaration was previously found ineffective per the

office action submitted on September 2nd, 2004.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Reeder, U.S. Patent No. 5,852,812, December 22, 1998, discloses a billing

system for a network, column 5, line 67 to column 6, line 18.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Smith whose telephone number is (571) 272-

6763. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jeff Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Matthew Gart
Primary Examiner
August 18, 2006